

**Subject:** Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 3rd dbase submittal  
**From:** Dennis Rader  
**Date:** 12/02/2016 02:24 PM  
**To:** Lorena Parker  
**CC:** Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net>

Lorena, it sure looks like it.

On Fri, Dec 2, 2016 at 1:25 PM, Lorena Parker <[lparker@sanpedrobid.com](mailto:lparker@sanpedrobid.com)> wrote:  
Dennis/Edward,

I want to make sure I have the final database. Is it this one?

Can someone please send it to me.

Thank you  
Lorena Parker  
*Executive Director*  
*San Pedro Property Owners' Alliance*  
**San Pedro Historic Waterfront**  
**Business Improvement District**  
390 W. 7th Street | San Pedro, CA 90731  
T [310.832.2183](tel:310.832.2183) | F [310.832.0685](tel:310.832.0685)  
[lparker@sanpedrobid.com](mailto:lparker@sanpedrobid.com)  
[www.sanpedrobid.com](http://www.sanpedrobid.com)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Edward Henning** <[mred2@earthlink.net](mailto:mred2@earthlink.net)>  
Date: Fri, Nov 4, 2016 at 2:56 PM  
Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 3rd dbase submittal  
To: Dennis Rader <[dennis.rader@lacity.org](mailto:dennis.rader@lacity.org)>  
Cc: Lorena Parker <[lparker@sanpedrobid.com](mailto:lparker@sanpedrobid.com)>

Hi Dennis - thanks for the feedback. My responses are shown below in red in your email. Regarding mixed-use buildings with 1st floor commercial and some form of upper floor residential - since 2012, all 5 of such identified buildings were assessed fully at commercial rates with none at residential rates. This includes the one you mention in note #3 in your email (7455006001) plus 4 others highlighted in orange in Column "AK" of my dbase. It appears that the only application of the lower residential building area rates in the San Pedro BID is for residential condos and freestanding houses and apartments. This nuance was not mentioned in the 2012 MDP or ER (that I can detect) but this is how the formula was applied by the last Consultant in 2012 and each subsequent year since. Our renewal goal was to keep matters the same as much as possible for non-government parcels from the BID structure used over the past 5 years so I'd like to keep this formula nuance the same for the upcoming 10 year renewal period. I will cover this nuance in the new MDP and ER with justification to be determined.

All other numbers except as noted below remain the same including the Zone 3 land area rate. The total assessment revenue does drop slightly by deleting the few inadvertent Zone 3 building areas left in the last submittal version.

Thanks Dennis - let me know if this works for you or if other questions arise.

**Ed Henning, Principal Consultant**  
**Edward Henning & Associates**  
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Rader  
Sent: Nov 4, 2016 2:52 PM  
To: Edward Henning  
Cc: Lorena Parker  
Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 3rd dbase submittal

Ed, the 3rd submittal of the San Pedro data looks good, except for:

1) The assessable land area of parcel 7440031905. You show 44,943 in the data, but the assessor map shows 32,400. Where did the higher figure come from?

I re-checked and the correct number (32,400 SF) was shown in the the "Selected Assessable Land Area" column (cell T19). The 44,943 SF is shown in the 2016 NBS column (cell S19)

2) I had a question regarding parcels 7440030906 & 7440031904. They both have building sqft as part of the assessment, yet all the other parcels in the same zone 2 have had the building sqft removed. Is there a reason for that?

Corrected - These have been changed to 0.

3) Parcel 7455006001. In my email to you, I had the corrected sqft split up between the ground floor commercial and the two residential upper floors, but you put the entire 19,820 sqft in the non-residential column. Was there a reason for that?

See my note in the email text above. Mixed-use buildings have been assessed at commercial building rates since 2012.

Those were the only questions I had, the remainder of the data looks good.

On Wed, Nov 2, 2016 at 12:52 PM, Dennis Rader <[dennis.rader@lacity.org](mailto:dennis.rader@lacity.org)> wrote:

Thanks Ed, I'll take a look.

On Wed, Nov 2, 2016 at 12:40 PM, Edward Henning <[mred2@earthlink.net](mailto:mred2@earthlink.net)> wrote:

Sorry - that should be "\$174,165" for Zone 3 program costs.

Ed

-----Original Message-----

From: Lorena Parker

Sent: Nov 2, 2016 12:03 PM

To: Edward Henning

Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 3rd dbase submittal

Ed,

Please clarify

Zone 3 program cost (\$1754,165) ???

Lorena Parker

*Executive Director*

*San Pedro Property Owners' Alliance*

**San Pedro Historic Waterfront**

**Business Improvement District**

390 W. 7th Street | San Pedro, CA 90731

T [310.832.2183](tel:310.832.2183) | F [310.832.0685](tel:310.832.0685)

[lparker@sanpedrobid.com](mailto:lparker@sanpedrobid.com)

[www.sanpedrobid.com](http://www.sanpedrobid.com)

On Wed, Nov 2, 2016 at 10:42 AM, Edward Henning <[mred2@earthlink.net](mailto:mred2@earthlink.net)> wrote:

Hi Dennis - attached is the revised San Pedro BID dbase. Also attached is a slightly revised assessment rate chart for Yr 1 of the renewal . Changes are highlighted in yellow.

**Notes:**

1. Cells with new or corrected data are highlighted in yellow. I removed my embedded comments from the 2nd submittal and added new ones where needed.
2. My notes to your original comments from Oct 12 are inserted in the copy of your email below and shown in red)
3. Benefit Zone designations have been changed from the old Zone 1A, Zone 1B, Zone 2 to simply Zone 1, 2 and 3.
4. The Zone 3 (old Zone 2) assessment basis has been changed from solely building area to solely land area.
5. I obtained the Zone 3 land areas directly from the acreage shown on the APN maps and converted to sq ft. These numbers again seem to differ from NBS' same data which was derived from LA County master tapes/disks.
6. The new Zone 3 assessment rate (land area) is \$0.0096118 which was derived by dividing the estimated 2018 Zone 3 program cost (\$1754,165) by the total assessable Zone 3 Port land area (18,119,799 sq ft which excludes the half interest Long Beach parcel APN 7440-034-907 of 14,790).

Thank you again for your help and patience with this matter.

**Ed Henning, Principal Consultant**

**Edward Henning & Associates**

[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Rader

Sent: Oct 12, 2016 10:57 AM  
To: Edward Henning  
Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 2nd dbase submittal

Hi Ed, I have finished my first review of the San Pedro data and I had some questions and/or data revisions (not that many).

1) What was the source of the building sqft on Harbor Dept expansion-area parcels? I know that in the past the Harbor Dept itself would weigh in on what sqft we were to use.

My understanding is that the source was the Port Real Estate Dept but it is moot now since we've changed the Zone 3 (was Zone 2) assessment basis to land area and not building area.

2) What happened to LA/LB City parcels 7440-034-906 & 907, labeled on the assr map as abandoned railroad, are they exempt? Are you meaning to include exempt parcels that are within the boundary at zero assessment, or exclude them altogether from the list?

These were missed by NBS when they prepared the dbase for the expansion area. I've now included them and split the land area if half for each entity and assessed accordingly.

3) 7440-035-904: this is 22nd Street Park, there don't appear to be any structures on this parcel, but you have 25,000. There are two warehouses on adjacent parcel 7440-034-901, but not on this parcel.

Again, missed by NBS but is now included and assessed.

4) Parcel 7440-036-904 isn't listed, and it looks to have many scattered structures on it. I don't know if you included the structures on a different parcel?

Again, missed by NBS but is now included and assessed.

5) You listed 7440-039-911 & 7440-040-907 as partially AG1 zoned and exempt from assessment. These two parcels actually have partially R4 & M2 zoning associated with them which are assessable zoning types. Parcels that have only partially exempt zoning are actually completely assessable. I noticed that there are some buildings on these parcels, did you still want to exempt them?

If virtually all the expansion area parcels weren't owned by the Port (and will remain so probably in perpetuity), I would consider partial assessment of these mixed zoning parcels like we've done in other BIDs where multiple owners were involved. But since we know the revenue amount we need to provide BID services to this area (mainly shuttle bus), the assessment rate for fully assessable (Port) parcels can be adjusted to generate the needed assessment revenue.

6) 7455-002-028: parcel area calculates to exactly 14,450. I'd use this value. OK - correction made.

7) 7455-004-005: County records show 10,224 building sqft, and google street view shows possible partial second floor. I'd use County value of 10,224. OK - correction made.

8) 7455-005-903: this is part of a large parking lot, remove building sqft. OK - correction made.

9) 7455-006-001: building area: this is ground floor commercial 8,420 sqft and two residential floors above at 11,400 sqft for a total of 19,820 sqft. OK - correction made.

10) 7455-013-904: this is part of a large parking lot, remove building sqft. OK - correction made.

11) 7455-025-900: the parcel area of this median is  $80 \times 955 = 76,400$  (not 54,671). OK - correction made.

Please let me know if you have any questions/responses to the above, thanks Ed.

On Thu, Sep 22, 2016 at 3:46 PM, Edward Henning <mred2@earthlink.net> wrote:

Hi Dennis - here is 2nd draft of the San Pedro BID dbase. Based on your Sep 15 email - here are some explanatory notes:

1. I embedded some clarification notes in the spreadsheet for the first 50 or so parcels for public and private parcel examples you cited in your Sep 15 email
2. Beyond that point I generally selected NBS's 2016 land area data since that was the info I was given for this renewal project and there appears to be a fair amount of questionable data from both the City approved 2012 land area data as the info obtained by NBS. The main exception is for all the condo land areas which were not pro-rated by NBS - only bulk land data was provided. I've pro-rated each condo land figure based on the # of units in each complex.
3. Note: Zone 2 parcels are assessed only for building area (if any) - not land area.
4. Figures altered since the last submittal are highlighted in yellow.
5. Please note that blank cells in either the 2012 land area or 2012 building area columns generally means that NBS's 2016 data was the same as the City approved 2012 data for unchanged parcels.
6. Please use the first spreadsheet tab labeled "All parcels merged". I'm not certain that all other tab data was changed to match the suggested tab. I will sync each tab at a later time.

Please let me know as you go along if any questions or major issues. Thank you again for your time and great efforts on each of these BIDs.

**Ed Henning, Principal Consultant**  
**Edward Henning & Associates**  
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

-----Original Message-----

From: Edward Henning

Sent: Sep 21, 2016 4:32 PM

To: Dennis Rader

Cc: Lorena at San Pedro BID

Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 1st dbase submittal

Hi Dennis - I haven't forgotten about you and the San Pedro dbase - it's just that upon further review, there were additional land area data glitches that I found that may have started in 2007, carried over to 2012 and are now re-surfacing with your current review. That simple 45 x 100 rectangle parcel example you pointed out that should be 4500 sq ft (my response to you last week incorrectly says 7500 sq ft but should have said 4500 sq ft - sorry) - well some of these parcel areas were off by a few feet back in 2012 and now in 2016 show correctly by NBS (LA County data source) but others were correct in 2012 and are off in 2016.

I wanted to just choose either using the 2012 data for all unchanged parcels or the new 2016 data but it appears that there are overt errors in both sets of data (assuming that the APN maps are accurate and the lot dimensions are actually whole numbers, like 45 x 100. If it's actually 45.1 x 100, this would produce an area of 4510, or 10 sq ft off from what we think is 4500 sq ft even. I don't have a simple solution other than to show you both sets of data (City approved 2012 data and the current NBS provided 2016 data) and have you choose the correct one or even a new correct figure based on your source(s).

There are also a few other 1/2 undivided interest parcels (LA/Long Beach) and it appears that the assessment methodology was inconsistently applied to these oddball parcels back in 2012 where the whole parcel area was assessed and levied on City of Long Beach with the City of LA getting a pass. Not sure if these were negotiated arrangements or just arbitrarily applied assessments. I will highlight my data cell questions on the resubmitted excel file.

I will re-submit the dbase soon once I've corrected some of the obvious errors as you pointed out in your email.

Thanks for your help and patience on this one Dennis. FYI I'll also be submitting the merged 2000 parcel South Park I & II BID dbase probably the first of next week which is a real doozy with all the bizarre commercial condos around the LA Live and Staples Center.

**Ed Henning, Principal Consultant**

**Edward Henning & Associates**

[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

-----Original Message-----

From: Edward Henning

Sent: Sep 16, 2016 1:11 PM

To: Dennis Rader

Cc: Lorena at San Pedro BID

Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 1st dbase submittal

Hi Dennis - thanks for your initial review and feedback on the 1st draft of the San Pedro BID dbase. As I mentioned earlier, I was handed an "updated" dbase prepared by NBS for this BID and there were numerous glitches in the parcel data, some of which I corrected or filled in when missing and others which I appear to have compounded for some unexplained reason.

The main issue, as you pointed out, is that the land data is off by a few feet almost across the board on even simple rectangle parcels with square corners. I encounter this all the time with my online data source (Parcel Quest) and with 3rd party providers like NBS and Wildan. They all insist that they derive their parcel data directly from LA County tapes which as you pointed out, these errors defy simple logic. Attached is a screen grab of the sample parcel you mentioned from my source, Parcel Quest, that also shows the "4,499" sq ft figure for this parcel that is obviously 7,500 sq ft (45' x 100'). If I visited a County Assessor office and used their in house computer terminal, it would show the correct 7,500 sq ft figure but each parcel has to be individually called up on the screen for review. This is the main reason I left a column in my dbase showing the 2012 data since I figured these numbers were already reviewed and approved by your Division, but I didn't just want to ignore all the data paid for and provided by NBS for the SP BID.

I've discussed this problem with Garen in the past and our only guess is that there is a separate phantom set of parcel land area data issued by the County that was generated from a scribed method that measures an area from a physically drawn map and the line thickness used on the map causes this repeat random error. I only offer this explanation because I observed it first hand a while back as a GIS tech person in some City was scribing lot dimensions and the enclosed lot area from a printed map using a scribing pen and the oddball results were similar. This same problem doesn't seem to apply to building area data except where the County has updated info based on physical changes to building sizes or new field measurements.

As far as APN Book/Block 7440-030 - yes, upon further review, the land data for that whole block is messed up - some with bad info from NBS and others with erroneous figures that I entered (possibly messed up with a re-sorting or a cut and paste error). I will re-do the land data for this whole block and re-check the other surrounding complex government owned blocks and re-submit the whole doc to you by Monday.

Regarding the first issue discussed above, if you see that most of the land area data from 2012 is still valid perhaps use an "OK" notation in your inserted "comments" column and we will just use the 2012 figures, where applicable.

Thanks again Dennis for your continued diligence and assistance with these BIDs and sorry for the myriad of data issues that complicate your reviews.

Talk soon. take care.

**Ed Henning, Principal Consultant**  
**Edward Henning & Associates**  
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

-----Original Message-----

From: Dennis Rader  
Sent: Sep 15, 2016 9:28 AM  
To: Edward Henning  
Cc: Lorena at San Pedro BID  
Subject: Re: San Pedro BID Renewal - 1st dbase submittal

Hi Ed, I've just started looking at the San Pedro data and I already have some questions regarding the land area that I've initially noticed. I'm not sure where the final numbers are coming from? For example:

Parcels 7440030911 & 919 share an undivided 1/2 interest in a 23,000 sqft parcel of land (from assr map), which would equal 11,500 each. This was the number used for the last renewal. But in your spreadsheet, the corresponding LA values are 113,325 and 54,671. Where did those numbers come from?

Another example: so many of the parcels in zone 1A differ in land area by small values from the proposed data to the current, for example 7454003023. When the assr map shows 45x100 why would your value be 4499 vs. 4500?

Let know about these so I know how to proceed with the data review, thanks.

On Mon, Aug 1, 2016 at 12:53 AM, Edward Henning <[mred2@earthlink.net](mailto:mred2@earthlink.net)> wrote:

Hi Dennis - I'm assisting San Pedro BID with their next renewal which expires June 30, 2017 (property tax year). Attached is an excel "dbase" of all parcels within the San Pedro BID including a proposed 14 large parcel expansion (mainly Port of LA) to the south along the waterfront. The raw data was provided to us by NBS but I've made many adjustments for missing data (mainly government parcels) either from 2012 renewal data or from the Port of LA themselves on all expansion parcels. Also attached is the list of proposed Yr 1 assessment rates within 3 zones (1A, 1B and 2). We may end up calling these simply Zone 1, 2 and 3 but it's still being considered. Condo complexes (both residential and commercial) and assessed based on their building area plus their proportionate land area based on the total number of combined condo units divided into the parcel land area. Street frontage is not an assessment factor in this BID. I'll be working on getting the MDP and ER submitted in the next 15-30 days.

Also attached is a rough boundary map which includes the proposed expansion but doesn't yet show the Benefit Zones nor APNs or parcel IDs. We'll get this to you soon.

Please don't hesitate to contact me when/as questions arise.

Thanks again for your help on this project.

**Ed Henning, Principal Consultant**  
**Edward Henning & Associates**  
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
[213-978-1120](tel:213-978-1120)

**Ed Henning, Principal Consultant**  
**Edward Henning & Associates**  
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

--  
Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
[213-978-1120](tel:213-978-1120)

**Ed Henning, Principal Consultant**  
**Edward Henning & Associates**  
[760-868-9963](tel:760-868-9963)

--  
Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
[213-978-1120](tel:213-978-1120)

--  
Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
[213-978-1120](tel:213-978-1120)

--  
Dennis Rader  
Technical Research Supervisor  
Los Angeles City Clerk, NBID Division  
213-978-1120